

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1, 3-6 and 9-26 are pending in the above-identified application. 2 and 7-8 have been cancelled.

Applicants appreciate the indication in the Office Action that claims 3 and 4 are allowable.

Claims 1, 10-12, 14-16 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Chang, Davis et al. and Hong et al. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection.

Applicant's gratefully acknowledge an interview granted by the Examiner on August 18, 2008. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that claim 3 includes features neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art. Further, the Examiner recommended amending the remaining claims to include the allowable features of claim 3. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable features of claim 3.

With regard to claim 1, neither Chang, Davis et al., Hong et al., nor their combination disclose or suggest,

- ... (e) presenting the extracted one section of the stored portion of EPG speech files through audio speakers;
- (f) receiving an indication of a location on a page of text corresponding to the extracted section of the stored speech files;
- (g) transmitting the received indication to the server at the remote location;
- (h) receiving, from the server at the remote location, a further portion of the EPG speech files corresponding to the received indication; and
- (i) presenting the further portion of the EPG speech files through the audio speakers.

Basis for this amendment may be found throughout the specification and, for example, at paragraphs [0049] and [0050]. No new matter has been added.

Because neither Chang, Davis et al., Hong et al., nor their combination disclose or suggest the features of claim 1, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in

view of Chang, Davis et al. and Hong et al. Claims 10 and 22 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 10 and 22 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang, Davis et al. and Hong et al.

Claims 11 and 15, while not identical to claim 1, include features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claims 11 and 15 are also not subject to rejection for the same reasons as those set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Claims 12, 14 and 23 depend from claim 11 and claim 16 depends from claim 15. Accordingly, claims 12, 14, 16 and 23 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang, Davis et al. and Hong et al.

Claims 5 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Chang, Davis et al., Hong et al. and Oh. As described above, the Examiner indicated that features of claim 3, now included in claims 1 and 15, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art. Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and claim 20 depends from claim 15. Accordingly, claims 5 and 20 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang, Davis et al., Hong et al. and Oh.

Claims 6 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Chang, Davis et al., Hong et al. and Van Kommer. As described above, the Examiner indicated that features of claim 3, now included in claims 1 and 15, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art. Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and claim 21 depends from claim 15. Accordingly, claims 6 and 21 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang, Davis et al., Hong et al. and Van Kommer.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Chang, Davis et al., Hong et al. and Cannon et al. As described above, the Examiner indicated that features of claim 3, now included in claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art. Claim 9 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, claim 9 is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang, Davis et al., Hong et al. and Cannon et al.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Chang, Davis et al., Hong et al. and Yuschik. As described above, the Examiner indicated that features of claim 3, now included in claim 11, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art.

Claim 13 depends from claim 11. Accordingly, claim 13 is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang, Davis et al., Hong et al. and Yuschik.


Claims 17-19 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Chang and Adams et al. Claim 17, while not identical to claim 1, include features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claim 17 is also not subject to rejection for the same reasons as those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claims 18-19 and 24 depend from claim 17. Accordingly, claims 18-19 and 24 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang and Adams et al.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Chang, Davis et al., Hong et al. and Adams et al. As described above, the Examiner indicated that features of claim 3, now included in claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art. Claim 25 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, claim 25 is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang, Davis et al., Hong et al. and Adams et al.

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Chang, Davis et al., Hong et al. and Asakawa et al. As described above, the Examiner indicated that features of claim 3, now included in claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art. Claim 26 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, claim 26 is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chang, Davis et al., Hong et al. and Asakawa et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 3-6 and 9-26.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)

KNN/DFD/pb

Dated: September 9, 2008